



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,321	12/31/2003	Michael D. Kotzin	CS10665	1712
20280 7590 08/24/2009				
MOTOROLA INC				
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45				
W4 - 39Q				
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343				
EXAMINER				
LEE, CHUN KUAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2181				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/24/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM

ADB035@Motorola.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/749,321
Filing Date: December 31, 2003
Appellant(s): KOTZIN, MICHAEL D.

Lawrence Chapa
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 05/26/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/22/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA)

Specification, page 1, lines 10-24

US Patent 6,957,217

Raverdy et al.

10-2005

US Patent 5,552,776

Wade et al.

09-1996

US Patent 6,433,704 Fushiki et al. 08-2002

US Patent 6,684,279 Kruse et al. 01-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 6-7, 10-11, 15-16 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Raverdy et al. (US Patent 6,957,217).

2. As per claims 1 and 15, AAPA teaches a presence attribute information server and a manager application comprising:

receiving and transmitting user presence attribute information (e.g. presence information of subset of users) (Specification, p. 1, ll.10-24), wherein the presence information for subset of user is received and transmitted in the instant message system/applications; and

an access condition (e.g. on-line status condition for predefined subset of users) is the condition when the corresponding user presence attribute information (e.g. presence information for subset of user) is available to the corresponding identified one

or more users (e.g. user to be alerted) (Specification, p. 1, ll. 17-24), as historically the instant message system/applications make available the presence information for the subset of users to the user base on the on-line status condition of the subset of users.

AAPA does not teach the presence attribute information server and the manager application comprising: a processor; an interface unit ...; and a storage unit ...; wherein said access authorization entries are each associated with corresponding user presence attribute information entries

Raverdy teaches a presence attribute information server and a manager application comprising:

a processor (CPU 512 of Fig. 5);

an interface unit (I/O interfaces 520 of Fig. 5), coupled to the processor, including a data input device for receiving data (e.g. user presence attribute information) and a network interface for transmitting data (e.g. user presence attribute information) (col. 8, ll. 43-50), wherein data are received and transmitted via downloading and uploading through a network (Fig. 1, ref. 130, 150); in combination with AAPA's above teaching, the user presence attribute information would be received and transmitted;

a storage unit (server memory 516 of Fig. 5 and Fig. 6), coupled to the interface unit (Fig. 5, ref. 520) and the processor (Fig. 5, ref. 512), including user presence attribute information (e.g. user information 618 and access right manager 626 of Fig. 6) and associated access authorization information (e.g. information stored in and utilized by the login/configuration manager 620 of Fig. 6 for implementing a login procedure to initially connect the user device to the event server, therefore the corresponding user

presence attribute information transferred during and after the login procedure must be associated with the access authorization information) organized and arranged as one or more entries in a data structure (Fig. 7 and col. 9, l. 26 to col. 10, l. 39);

wherein said access authorization entries are each associated with corresponding user presence attribute information entries (as the user device must initially login to be connected (Fig. 9, ref. 924), therefore the access authorization entries must each be associated with the corresponding user presence attribute information entries for the corresponding logged in user device), each user presence attribute information entry having a presence attribute value field, corresponding to one or more types of presence attributes (e.g. user profile, location information, access right) (col. 10, ll. 18-39), and

each access authorization information entry having a user field identifying one or more users (e.g. user data) and one or more access condition entries (e.g. access code), wherein the access condition entries define the condition that data is available (e.g. condition that data is available if the entered access code is correct) (col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, ll. 26-43), wherein the user device must be identified to implement the login properly, as the user data comprising user profile (Fig. 4, ref. 412), along with the correct access code is transferred to the event server during the login procedure.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Raverdy's access authorization functionalities into AAPA's system for the benefit of increasing security for data accessing by selectively

providing data to a user device (Raverdy, col. 1, ll. 56-64) to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 15.

3. As per claim 6, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 1 as discussed above, where both further teach the presence attribute information server comprising wherein at least one of the one or more access condition entries includes a proximity relative to a predetermined location (e.g. location profile) (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, ll. 12-13 and Raverdy, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, ll. 26-43).

4. As per claim 7, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 6 as discussed above, where both further teach the presence attribute information server comprising wherein the predetermined location includes a specific place (e.g. location) (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, ll. 12-13 and Raverdy, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, ll. 26-43).

5. As per claim 10, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 6 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the presence attribute information server comprising wherein the location is relative to the at least one of item or person (e.g. user device) associated with the user presence attribute information (Raverdy, col. 4, ll. 48-54, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, ll. 26-43).

6. As per claim 11, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 6 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the presence attribute information

server comprising wherein the location is relative to the user requesting (e.g. user utilizing the user device at a particular location) the user presence attribute information (Raverdy, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, ll. 26-56).

7. As per claim 16, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 15 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the manager application comprising wherein said interface unit is further adapted for receiving access conditions (e.g. access code and other user data) associated with one or more users, which are used to formulate access authorization entries (Raverdy, col. 9, ll. 26-43).

8. As per claim 19, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 15 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the manager application further comprising a broadcast unit (e.g. wireless interface), coupled to the interface unit and the storage unit (Raverdy, col. 8, ll. 23-35), the broadcast unit being adapted to transmit updated user presence attribute information (e.g. time-stamped access information) to at least one of a presence attribute information server (Raverdy, Fig. 1, ref. 130, 122) and subscribed users (e.g. user device (Raverdy, Fig. 1, ref. 114) utilized by the user), that are currently authorized to receive updates, when the user presence attribute information changes (Raverdy, Fig. 9, ref. 940 and col. 11, ll. 52-63), as the access right of the user device expires the updated information comprising the termination of the connection is transferred to the LAN then to the base station and finally to the user utilizing the user device.

9. As per claim 20, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 19 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the manager application comprising wherein the broadcast unit includes a set of prestored instructions for execution by the processor (Raverdy, col. 9, ll. 10-14).

10. As per claim 21, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 19 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the manager application comprising wherein the presence attribute information manager application is incorporated as part of a portable electronic device (Raverdy, col. 4, ll. 48-54).

11. As per claim 22, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitation of claim 21 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the manager application comprising wherein the portable electronic device is a wireless radio frequency telephone (e.g. cellular telephone device) (Raverdy, col. 4, ll. 48-54).

12. Claims 2-5 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Raverdy et al. (US Patent 6,957,217) as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of Wade et al. (US Patent 5,552,776).

13. As per claim 2, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above, where, Raverdy further teaches the presence attribute information

server comprising selectively providing information to the user device comprising access to various services and content information based on time-stamped access information (Raverdy, col. 11, ll. 6-63).

AAPA and Raverdy do not expressly teach the presence attribute information server comprising wherein at least one of the one or more access condition entries includes a predetermined period of time to be matched.

Wade teaches a security system and method for controlling access to computing device comprising matching of a predetermined period of time in order to gain access into the computing device (Fig. 3; col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Wade's matching of the predetermined period of time into AAPA and Raverdy's presence attribute information server for the benefit of providing an enhanced versatile and flexible security control over access of data in a computing device (Wade, col. 2, ll. 18-29) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

14. As per claim 3, AAPA, Raverdy and Wade teach all the limitations of claim 2 as discussed above, where Wade further teaches the presence attribute information server comprising wherein the predetermined period of time includes a time of day (Wade, Fig. 3, col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

15. As per claim 4, AAPA, Raverdy and Wade teach all the limitations of claim 2 as discussed above, where Wade further teaches the presence attribute information server

comprising wherein the predetermined period of time includes a day of the week (Wade, Fig. 3, col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

16. As per claim 5, AAPA, Raverdy and Wade teach all the limitations of claim 2 as discussed above, where Wade further teaches the presence attribute information server comprising wherein a predetermined period of time includes a point in time identifying the beginning of the predetermined period and a point in time identifying the end of the predetermined period (Wade, Fig. 3, col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

17. As per claims 13-14, AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitations of claims 1 as discussed above, where both further teach the presence attribute information server comprising:

an access validation unit, coupled to the interface unit and the storage unit, the access validation unit being adapted for validating the received access code and other user data (Raverdy, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, l. 26 to col. 10, l. 39);

receiving the user presence attribute information (e.g. presence information of subset of users) associated with at least one of a particular item or a particular person (e.g. subset of users) (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, l. 10-24);

receiving one or more status information relative to the user attempting to access the user presence attribute information (e.g. receiving access code and user profile from the user), and status information (e.g. on-line status information) of the at least one of the particular item or the particular person associated with the user presence attribute

information (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, I. 10-24 and Raverdy, col. 7, II. 22-43; col. 9, I. 26 to col. 10, I. 39), as the respective status information are received in order to make a proper determination corresponding to granting the user access to the user presence attribute information, and

comparing the one or more of the status information of the user attempting to access the user presence attribute information, and the status information of the at least one of the particular item or the particular person associated with the user presence attribute information to the one or more corresponding access authorization entries associated with the user presence attribute information to determine if appropriate access conditions have been made (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, I. 10-24 and Raverdy, Fig. 9, ref. 924; col. 7, II. 22-43; col. 9, I. 10 to col. 11, I. 27), as the appropriate access conditions for the user to gain access to the presence information for the subset of users include the user providing the correct access code and user profile, and the subset of users are current on-line, wherein such determination is accomplished via the comparison, and

authorizing access to the user presence attribute information, if the comparison indicates that the appropriate access condition have been met (AAPA, Specification, p. 1, II. 10-24 and Raverdy, Fig. 9; col. 6, II. 62-65; col. 7, II. 22-43; col. 9, I. 10 to col. 11, I. 27); and

wherein the access validation unit includes a set of prestored instructions for execution by the processor (Raverdy, col. 9, II. 10-14).

AAPA and Raverdy do not expressly teach the presence attribute information server comprising: receiving a request; and the status information comprising the current time and date.

Wade teaches a security system and method for controlling access to computing device comprising:

access validation unit for receiving request to access a computing device (col. 8, ll. 53-65 and col. 16, l. 58 to col. 17, l. 7);

matching of a predetermined period of time in order to gain access into the computing device (Fig. 3; col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41); and

wherein the period of time include the time of date and date of week (Fig. 3; col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Wade's matching of the predetermined period of time into AAPA and Raverdy's presence attribute information server for the benefit of providing an enhanced versatile and flexible security control over access of data in a computing device (Wade, col. 2, ll. 18-29) to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-14.

18. Claims 8-9 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Raverdy et al. (US Patent 6,957,217) as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of Fushiki et al. (US Patent 6,433,704).

AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 15 as discussed above, where Raverdy further teaches the presence attribute information server and the manager application comprising:

a base station coupled to the user device (Raverdy, Fig. 1);
the location profiles (Raverdy, col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9 line 26-56); and
wherein said interface unit further includes a data output device (Raverdy, display 518 of Fig. 5) for presenting information in an iconic format (Raverdy, Fig. 5)

AAPA and Raverdy do not expressly teach the presence attribute information server and the manager application comprising:

wherein the predetermined location include the present place;
wherein the proximity corresponds to a predetermined distance;
presenting the condition associated with authorizing access in an iconic format;
and

the data input device is further adapted for modifying the conditions being presented by the data output device associated with authorizing access to user presence attribute information associated with one or more users.

Fushiki teaches a system and method comprising:

a communication device comprising of a communication interface, memory and processor (Fig. 2; Fig. 8; Fig. 10 and col. 4, ll. 24-37);

a longitude and latitude information to represent the present position of the portable terminal (Fig. 4; Fig. 6; Fig. 9 and col. 7, ll. 4-47); and

a coverage area (e.g. predetermined distance) for the corresponding communication device (Fig. 7 and col. 6, ll. 33-64);

the display screen (i.e. data output device) presenting requested information in an iconic format through using graphic user interface (GUI) for data inputting (Fig. 12 and col. 9, ll. 4-44); and

the GUI is adapted to modify the requested information being presented by the display screen (Fig. 12 and col. 9, ll. 4-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Fushiki's longitude and latitude information, coverage area, presenting the requested information and the input device modifying the data presented by the output device into AAPA and Raverdy's the presence attribute information server and the manager application for the benefit of enabling accurate determination of the position of the user device globally to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8-9 and 17-18. The resulting combination of the references teaches the presence attribute information server and the manager application comprising:

wherein the predetermined location includes the longitude and latitude information;

wherein the proximity corresponds to the coverage area;

presenting the requested information in an iconic format, wherein the receiving of the requested information shows that the authorization access must been approved as user device is properly logged in; and

the GUI would modify the what is being presented by the display screen, wherein the request data would be displayed only if the user device is properly logged in, therefore the presented information would be associated with authorizing access to user presence attribute information associated with one or more users utilizing the user device.

19. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Raverdy et al. (US Patent 6,957,217) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kruse et al. (US Patent 6,684,279).

AAPA and Raverdy teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 15 as discussed above, where both further teach the presence attribute information server comprising:

wherein the user information contains access conditions (e.g. user data of Fig. 4) for the associated user presence attribute information (AAPA, Specification, p. 2, ll. 19-22 and Raverdy, col. 9, ll. 26-56); and

determining whether the user device is authorized or precluded to access the associated user presence attribute information during the login procedure (AAPA, Specification, p. 2, ll. 19-22 and Raverdy, Fig. 9, ref. 924).

AAPA and Raverdy do not expressly teach the presence attribute information server comprising wherein access condition entries include a flag which, when an access condition is met, identifies whether access to the associated presence information is authorized or precluded.

Kruse teaches a method and apparatus for controlling data transfer comprising setting a flag when a condition is met, which identifies whether the access to a bus is authorized or precluded (Fig. 11 and col. 22, ll. 30-43)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Kruse's flag into AAPA and Raverdy's access condition entries for the benefit of providing data access control without using another dedicated signal line (Kruse, col. 24, ll. 32-36) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

20. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Raverdy et al. (US Patent 6,957,217) and Wade et al. (US Patent 5,552,776).

AAPA teaches a method comprising receiving user presence attribute information; and identifying a user accessing the user presence attribute information (Specification, p. 1, ll. 10-24), wherein the user need to be identified in order to properly establish the buddy list.

AAPA does not teach the method comprising a request; determining whether ... is authorized ...; receiving any conditions ...; determine whether the received conditions ... have been met ...; and wherein, if the user has met the conditions ... forward the user presence attribute information

Raverdy teaches a system and a method for managing access to data comprising:

identifying a user accessing data (col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, l. 26 to col. 10, l. 39), wherein the user must be identified to implement the login properly, as the user data comprising the user profile (Fig. 4, ref. 412), along with the correct access code is transferred to the event server during the login procedure;

determining whether the user attempting to access the data is authorized to have access to the data (Raverdy, Fig. 9, ref. 924, wherein the user must provide the correct access code and the corresponding user data in order to have access) (col. 9, l. 10 to col. 11, l. 27) including

receiving any conditions relative to the user associated with receiving access to the data (col. 7, ll. 22-43 and col. 9, l. 26 to col. 10, l. 39), wherein the received condition comprising the access code and the user data including the user profile is associated with the data to be accessed, and

determining whether the received conditions relative to the user associated with the receiving access have been met (Fig. 9, ref. 924 and col. 9, l. 10 to col. 11, l. 27), as the user gain access under the determined condition that the correct access code and user profile are provided;

wherein, if the conditions relative to the user associated with receiving access have been met, then forwarding the data to the user (col. 6, ll. 62-65), as the data is forwarded to the user under the condition that the correct access code and user profile are provided.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Raverdy's access authorization functionalities into

AAPA's system for the benefit of increasing security for data accessing by selectively providing data to a user device (Raverdy, col. 1, ll. 56-64) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

AAPA and Raverdy do not expressly teach the presence attribute information server and the method for managing the access to presence attribute information comprising: a request; and the status information comprising the current time and date.

Wade teaches a security system and method for controlling access to computing device comprising:

access validation unit for receiving request to access a computing device (col. 8, ll. 53-65 and col. 16, l. 58 to col. 17, l. 7);

matching of a predetermined period of time in order to gain access into the computing device (Fig. 3; col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41); and

wherein the period of time include the time of date and date of week (Fig. 3; col. 7, ll. 20-46 and col. 9, l. 35 to col. 10, l. 41).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention was made to include Wade's matching of the predetermined period of time into AAPA and Raverdy's presence attribute information server for the benefit of providing an enhanced versatile and flexible security control over access of data in a computing device (Wade, col. 2, ll. 18-29) to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

(10) Response to Argument

I. claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 19-22

Issue I

Appellant seems to argue (on pages 5-8) that AAPA does not teach access conditions to be associated with one or more users that may be attempting to obtain the user the user presence attributes, because the claimed access condition is not equivalent to online status, as the online status is one type of example of user presence information; additionally, being on-line is not in and of itself a condition associated with a particular user's presence attribute information, but is associated with access to the network or the system.

Examiner's response to Issue I

The examiner respectfully disagrees, and to further clarify the examiner's position, the section in appellant's background (i.e. AAPA) cited by the examiner, relevant to the appellant above argument, is as following:

"... Presence attributes are presently used as a way to define, manage and convey a user's relationship relative to a communication network. Present definitions allow for several different types of information to be managed, including ... a user's on-line status ... In general, presence attributes have the potential to convey a fair amount of personal information, which is linked to a particular user's current situation or status.

Presence information has historically been used in instant messaging type applications. In at least some instances, an instant messaging system will allow a buddy list to be maintained, which can alert a user as to the on-line status of a predefined subset of users, even when a user is not actively attempting to communicate with an individual on the buddy list ..." (Specification, Page 1, lines 10-21)

Under instant messaging type application, the condition for the user to access (e.g. be alerted of) user presence attribute information (e.g. on-line status

for the predefined subset of users in the buddy list) is when the predefined subset of users are online; more specifically, the access condition (e.g. on-line status condition) having the predefined subset of users being online needs to be satisfied, in order for the user to be alerted of the user presence attribute information corresponding to the buddy list.

Therefore, the examiner did not mischaracterize the actual statement made in appellant's background description

Issue II

Appellant seems to argue (on pages 5-8) that the combination of the references does not teach/suggest the claimed feature of access authorization entries associated with a particular user's presence attribute information, as said claimed feature is not taught/suggested by AAPA.

Examiner's response to Issue II

The examiner respectfully disagrees, because the examiner is not relying on AAPA along for the teaching of the claimed feature of access authorization entries associated with a particular user's presence attribute information, as Raverdy teaches access authorization entries associated with a particular event/location information (column 7, lines 22-43 and column 9, line 26 to column 10, line 39), and AAPA teaches conditional access to online data corresponding to user presence attribute information (Specification, page 1, lines 10-24), the

resulting combination of the references further teaches access authorization entries associated with a particular user presence attribute information.

Issue III

Appellant seems to argue (on pages 5-8) that the examiner addressed the claimed elements in piece-meal fashion without ever providing a nexus between the teaching of the two disparate references, as the examiner ignored Raverdy's silence regarding to user presence attribute information and providing conditional access to such information; alternatively, Raverdy is related to conditional access to event information, wherein the event information is not the same as the presence attribute information.

Examiner's response to Issue III

The examiner respectfully disagrees that AAPA and Raverdy lack a nexus between them, as AAPA teaches conditional access to online data corresponding to user presence attribute information, and Raverdy teaches defining access condition (e.g. defined in the server) for online data corresponding to event/location information (column 7, lines 22-43 and column 9, line 26 to column 10, line 39), wherein both AAPA and Raverdy are associated with accessing online data conditionally, and the resulting combination of AAPA and Raverdy further teaches defining access condition for online data corresponding to user presence attribute information.

Issue IV

Appellant seems to argue (on pages 5-8) that Raverdy's user information are contextually inconsistent with the claims, as Raverdy's user information is not information being received, but information being transmitted to the information server in order to confirm access to the event or location information (column 10, lines 31-39); whereas, the claims of the present application provide conditional access authorization entries, which alternatively defined the circumstances when one or more user are authorized to have access to a particular user's presence information.

Examiner's response to Issue IV

The examiner respectfully disagrees, to further clarify the examiner's position regarding Raverdy's user information (in Raverdy's column 10, lines 31-39), wherein the user information (e.g. user data) from a user device is received by the information server having access authorization entries to confirm access to event/location information; more specifically, the information server have defined circumstances when a user of the user device are authorized to have access to the particular event/location information; and by combining Raverdy with AAPA's conditional access to online data corresponding to user presence attribute information, the resulting combination of the references further teaches the information server have defined circumstances when the user of the user device are authorized to have access to the particular user presence attribute information.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Chun-Kuan Lee
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2181

Conferees:

/Alford W. Kindred/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2181

/Kevin L. Ellis/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2117